

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

Docket No. 00-0441

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

LEONARD A. MANS

ON BEHALF OF

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY

d/b/a AmerenUE

St. Louis, Missouri
February 23, 2001

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

Docket No. 00-0441

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

LEONARD A. MANS

ON BEHALF OF

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY

d/b/a AmerenUE

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Leonard A. Mans and my business address is 1901 Chouteau Avenue,
St. Louis, Missouri 63103.

**Q. Are you the same Leonard Mans that previously filed Direct Testimony on
behalf of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE in this case, Docket
No. 00-0441?**

A. Yes, I am.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to adjustments proposed in the Direct
Testimony of Staff Witness, Theresa Ebrey. The Staff proposes an adjustment to the total

amount of incremental costs incurred by AmerenUE as set forth in the Company's original filing.

Q. What is the nature of the adjustment proposed by the Staff?

A. In October 2000, the Staff performed an audit of incremental costs incurred in 1999, by AmerenUE in connection with its manufactured gas plant ("MGP") site. As a result of this audit, the Staff witness Theresa Ebrey proposes a decrease of \$430 in the amount of incremental costs incurred in 1999. The charges result from an internal cost called "Stores Handling Charge" that the Company assesses to purchase order payments processed by the Company's Accounts Payable Department. The Company concurs with the Staff that such costs are not recoverable under the EEAC and GEAC Riders should properly be excluded as an incremental cost.

Q. Has the Company taken any step to ensure that such costs in the future are not included as incremental costs under its Riders?

A. Yes. The Company has instructed the appropriate personnel to code all open and future purchase orders to omit such internal charges.

Q. Do you concur with Ms. Ebrey's assessment that AmerenUE should be allowed to recover \$12,222 for costs incurred in 1999?

A. Yes, I do.

45 **Q. As a result of this adjustment to incremental costs, is there a corresponding**
46 **change to the amount of overrecovery experienced by the Company?**

47 A. Yes. In 1999, the Company recovered excess revenue of \$29,548 and not
48 \$29,118 as originally proposed by AmerenUE. The Company concurs with the Staff's
49 calculation.

50

51 **Q. What does the Company intend to do with this overrecovery?**

52 A. The Company intends to refund said amounts during the current calendar year
53 2000.

54

55 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

56 A. Yes, it does.

57